sequence of segments and Osamu to teach that editing functions can be combined with a camera and video recorder in a portable housing.

In the explanation of the first ground of rejection, the Examiner admits that the combination of Washino and Freeman fails to teach that the editing means is within the housing of the recorder. The Examiner asserts that Osamu teaches that it is known to install an editing means within a housing of a video recorder.

In the explanation of the second ground of rejection, the Examiner admits that Peters fails to teach a motion camera in the housing of the recorder, but that Osamu teaches having a camera combined with a recorder. But the Examiner admits that Osamu fails to teach that editing specifies a sequence of segments of the stored motion video information.

Washino teaches recording of digital video information, as does Peters. Both Peters and Washino discuss how the recorded information may be provided to an editing system.

Freeman and Bohrman both teach editing systems, and Bohrman in particular teaches editing a sequence of segments of motion video information.

Osamu is the only reference relied by the Examiner as teaching an editing system that is within the housing of a recorder, but the Examiner admits that Osamu fails to teach that editing specifies a sequence of segments of the stored motion video information. In fact, Osamu only teaches that control buttons 106-120 are used to switch modes, change shutter speed, fade in, fade out and create digital titles.

Osamu fails to teach or suggest that a specific kind of editing means - one that allows a user to "specify a sequence of segments" of stored "motion video information" as claimed - should be installed in the housing of a video recorder. Such editing is dissimilar from changing shutter speed, fade in , fade out and digital titles. Thus, Osamu does *not* suggest combining teachings of Freeman or Bohrman in a housing of a video recorder, and the rejections (on both grounds) under 35 U.S.C. 103 are traversed.

Regarding the independent claims, the rejection is based on an assertion that the claims are directed to no more than the combination of well-known things, and that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the things taught in the prior art "to provide convenience to the user." This is the only reason provided for the Examiner for combining the prior art under the both grounds of rejection. There is no evidence, however, in this record to support the Examiner's assertion that, *at the time the invention was made*, one of ordinary skill in the art

would have recognized that the proposed combinations "would provide convenience to the user." This lack of evidence to support the Examiner's allegations of the motivation to combine prior art references renders the rejection improper. The recognition that the proposed combination "would provide convenience to the user" is merely hindsight, and the rejections (on both grounds) under 35 U.S.C. 103 are traversed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0876.

Respectfully submitted,

McKain et al.

By: _____

Peter J. Gordon, Reg. No. 35,164
Avid Technology, Inc.
One Park West
Avid Technology Park
Tewksbury, Massachusetts 01876
Tel. No.: 978.640.3011
Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 4, 2002
Docket Number: A95001C2